



**Personnel**

**★SURVIVAL, EVASION, RESISTANCE, AND ESCAPE (SERE)  
TRAINING SYSTEMS EVALUATION**

**COMPLIANCE WITH THIS PUBLICATION IS MANDATORY**

---

**NOTICE:** This publication is available digitally on the HQ AETC Publishing WWW site at: <http://www.aetc.randolph.af.mil/im>. If you lack access, contact your Base Publishing Manager.

---

OPR: HQ AETC/DOFA (MSgt R. Zipperer)  
Supersedes AETCI 36-2207, 25 July 1996

Certified by: HQ AETC/DOF (Col T. Gilbert)  
Pages: 7/Distribution: F

---

This instruction implements AFPD 36-22, *Military Training*. It establishes requirements for standardizing and evaluating SERE training systems and includes responsibilities for student training system evaluation and SERE training standardization/evaluation (stan/eval) program. It applies to HQ AETC/DOF and the 336th Training Group (336 TRG); it does not apply to Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve Command units. Further details will be published locally in a supplement to this instruction. Send one copy of each supplement to HQ AETC/DOF. See Attachment 1 for a glossary of references and supporting information.

Maintain and dispose of records created as a result of processes prescribed in this publication according to AFMAN 37-139, *Records Disposition Schedule*.

### **SUMMARY OF REVISIONS**

**This document is substantially revised and must be completely reviewed.** Deletes sections on the training review process and student administration procedures which will be integrated into AETCI 36-2205, *Flying Training Administration and Management*. Combines sections on the student training assessment program and training evaluation and analysis program into the section on training system evaluation and analysis program. Transfers all procedures performed by 19 AF/DOOS to HQ AETC/DOF due to reorganization. Establishes a no-notice instructor evaluation program at the 336TRG.

### **Section A—Training System Evaluation and Analysis Program**

#### **1. Overview:**

1.1. This section designates responsibilities for conducting training systems evaluation and analysis in order to identify notable strengths and improvement opportunities. It applies to all SERE training courses conducted by the 336 TRG.

1.2. A continuing evaluation and analysis program is required for improving and maintaining currency of SERE training systems. The program will include applicable internal and external evaluation

processes, which implement AFI 36-2201, *Developing, Managing, and Conducting Training*, and instructional systems development requirements. (See the AFH 36-2235 series, Volumes 1 through 11, *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems*.) Specific evaluation criteria and methods for analysis will be determined locally.

**2. Responsibilities of HQ AETC/DOF.** HQ AETC/DOF will:

2.1. Provide program policy and guidance.

2.2. Collect and analyze data for the external evaluation process by maintaining a liaison with the Air Force Inspector General for Safety (AFISC/SEL), MAJCOM life support offices, the DoD Executive Agent for Code of Conduct Training (Joint Personnel Recovery Agency [JPRA]), sister Services, rescue coordination centers, and other agencies that impact DoD SERE training. HQ AETC/DOF will ensure information and data relative to actual SERE experiences critical to the currency and effectiveness of SERE courses are forwarded to the 336 TRG.

**3. Responsibilities of the 336 TRG Commander.** The 336 TRG Commander will:

3.1. Ensure procedures exist to collect and analyze data for the internal evaluation process to improve the effectiveness and quality of training.

3.2. Ensure evaluation data is collected and analyzed. This information may be extracted from items such as student questionnaires, instructor comments, test monitor program, training observation reports (TOR), annual course review, course managers feedback, and the like.

3.3. Ensure students are allowed to provide subjective written course critique comments throughout all formal courses.

3.4. Track improvement efforts to ensure effectiveness of improvement actions.

3.5. Develop and conduct S-V81-A postgraduate evaluations within 6 months of graduation. Forward a semiannual report of findings to HQ AETC/DOF by 31 January and 31 July.

***Section B—SERE Training Standardization/Evaluation (Stan/Eval) Program***

**4. Overview.** The major objectives of the SERE Training Stan/Eval Program are to identify strengths and improvement opportunities for all formal SERE training programs, improve individual training and instructor proficiency, and enhance operational safety.

**5. HQ AETC/DOF Responsibilities.** HQ AETC/DOF will:

5.1. Administer the HQ AETC Stan/Eval Program for all SERE training activities.

5.2. Formulate and approve stan/eval directives, develop requirements, provide guidance, and evaluate training systems.

5.3. Develop stan/eval schedules and conduct stan/eval visits according to this instruction and special instructions from the AETC Commander.

5.4. Solicit recommendations for improving stan/eval programs from the AETC Commander.

**6. Responsibilities of the 336 TRG Commander.** The 336 TRG Commander will formulate and implement requirements and procedures supporting the stan/eval program according to this instruction. He or she will ensure evaluators assigned at group staff level are experienced SERE instructors with supervisory experience.

**7. Responsibilities of the 336 TRG Stan/Eval Office (336 TRG/CCV).** Office personnel will:

7.1. Administer the group stan/eval program.

7.2. Evaluate all formal courses attached to the 336TRG for compliance with approved courseware. Office personnel will also evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of the courses as related to standardization, professionalism, safety, and logistical support.

7.3. Establish a formal no-notice instructor evaluation program that evaluates a percentage of instructors teaching in all courses assigned to the 336 TRG.

7.4. Record no-notice evaluations on the appropriate AETC Form 610; that is, AETC Form 610O, **Instructor Evaluation Record – Operational Training**; AETC Form 610R, **Instructor Evaluation Record – Resistance Training**; or AETC Form 610S, **Instructor Evaluation Record – Academic Training**. No-notice evaluation results will be maintained in the instructor's stan/eval folder kept at the squadron level.

7.5. Establish a stan/eval review board (SRB) which will convene quarterly. The SRB will provide feedback on the effectiveness of the group's formal training courses, provide crossfeed between units on improvement opportunities, recommend changes to publications, evaluate the effectiveness of the stan/eval programs, and prescribe corrective action.

7.6. Ensure instructor evaluations are conducted according to this instruction.

**8. Responsibilities of the Squadron or Detachment Commander.** The commander will:

8.1. Actively support the squadron or detachment, group, and command SERE stan/eval programs.

8.2. Ensure each instructor receives an instructor evaluation by a certified supervisor or stan/eval personnel on an annual basis. This evaluation will be conducted within a 120-day window starting on the first day of the ninth month after the month of the instructor's most recent evaluation. When circumstances prevent the evaluation of an instructor during the 120-day window, the instructor will be decertified to instruct until he or she successfully completes an instructor evaluation.

8.3. Ensure significant findings of the instructor evaluation are documented on the appropriate AETC Form 610 (610O, 610R, or 610S).

8.4. Ensure action is taken to correct discrepancies.

**9. Unit Evaluations and Visits by HQ AETC/DOF.** HQ AETC/DOF personnel will perform periodic staff assistance visits (SAV) to the 336 TRG and subordinate units to maintain currency and

effectiveness of the training system. During formal headquarters evaluations, the Chief, HQ AETC/DOF, will augment the AETC Inspector General (IG) team.

## **10. Instructor Evaluation and Grading System:**

**10.1. Grading Scale.** The grading system consists of a Q1 (qualified), Q2 (qualified), and Q3 (unqualified) grading scale (with a four-level subareas) as follows:

**10.1.1. Q1 (Qualified).** The instructor's performance met the desired standards for subject mastery and instructional techniques. An adjective phrase of exceptionally qualified (EQ) may be included in the remarks section of the AETC Form 610 for individuals whose overall performance far exceeds the standards.

**10.1.2. Q2 (Qualified).** The instructor's performance met minimum standards for subject mastery and instructional techniques. Although this rating does not require decertification, additional training is required.

**10.1.3. Q3 (Unqualified).** The instructor did not meet the minimum standards for subject mastery or instructional techniques. The instructor will be decertified in the evaluated units of training. Recertification in the specified units of training by the immediate supervisor is required prior to resumption of instructor duties.

## **10.2. Subarea Grades:**

**10.2.1. E (Excellent).** The individual's instruction is above standards. No deviations occurred.

**10.2.2. S (Satisfactory).** The individual instructs correctly, efficiently, and skillfully. Minor deviations may occur, but are recognized and corrected in a timely manner and do not significantly detract from the overall performance.

**10.2.3. M (Marginal).** The individual instructs safely, but has limited knowledge or skill. Deviations occur that distract from his or her overall performance.

**10.2.4. U (Unsatisfactory).** The individual is unsafe or lacks sufficient knowledge or skill to instruct.

## **11. Grading Instructions.** Use the following grading instructions to evaluate an instructor:

11.1. If the instructor takes appropriate corrective action within a reasonable time, do not allow momentary deviations to adversely affect the overall rating level.

11.2. Consider overall performance when assigning the overall rating level, to include any serious breach of directives or compromise of safety. If an evaluator must place restrictions on the member being evaluated to ensure safety is not compromised, the evaluation will be rated unqualified.

11.3. Regardless of other scoring factors, any evaluation may be rated unqualified because of cumulative deviations from desired performance that reduce mission effectiveness to an unacceptable level.

11.4. On the appropriate evaluation form, the evaluator will enter comments that may include, but are not limited to, significant factors observed during the evaluation.

**12. Forms Prescribed.** AETC Forms 610O, 610R, and 610S.

WILLIAM WELSER III, Major General, USAF  
Director of Operations

***1 Attachment***

1. Glossary of References and Supporting Information

## Attachment 1

### GLOSSARY OF REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING INFORMATION

#### *References*

AFPD 36-22, *Military Training*  
AFI 36-2201, *Developing, Managing, and Conducting Training*  
AFM 36-2234, *Instructional Systems Development*  
AFH 36-2235 (series), *Information for Designers of Instructional Systems*

#### *Abbreviations and Acronyms*

ETCA—education and training course announcements  
EQ—exceptionally qualified  
IG—Inspector General  
JPRA—Joint Personnel Recovery Agency  
SAV—staff assistance visit  
SERE—survival, evasion, resistance, and escape  
SRB—stan/eval review board  
stan/eval—standardization/evaluation  
TOR—training observation report  
TRG—training group

#### *Terms*

**Evaluation**—A systematic process of judging how well individuals, procedures, or programs meet educational objectives. Evaluation of formal training courses includes internal and external evaluations.

**External evaluation**—The acquisition of feedback and management data (for example, survivor interview program, graduate evaluation, aircraft mishap reports, prisoner of war debriefs, and DoD exercises) from outside the formal training environment to assess the effectiveness of the training system.

**Formal training courses**—Training courses listed in the education and training course announcements (ETCA) database and the appropriate programmed flying training documents. (For a listing of ETCAs, see <http://hq2af.keesler.af.mil/etca.htm>.)

**Instructor evaluation**—An evaluation conducted by a certified supervisor or a squadron or group standardization evaluator to determine an individual's knowledge and proficiency in his or her instructional specialty.

**Internal evaluation**—The acquisition of internal feedback and management data (for example, student assessment, written tests, validation data, pretests, student questionnaires, personnel observations, training observation reports, local, and SAVs) from within the formal training environment to assess the effectiveness of the training system.

**No-notice evaluation**—An instructor evaluation conducted with no prior notice to the instructor or duty section.